COUNTY OF ELLIS **CAUSE NO: 90566 CITATION** DEC 1 8 2014 TO: VISION FINANCIAL CORPORATION C/O CORP SRVC CO, DBA CSC-LAWYERS INC DWL ar CARLOS B. LOZEZ 211 E 7TH ST, STE 620 CONSTABLE, PCT 5, TRAVES COUNTY, TEXAS **AUSTIN, TX 78701** Defendant, in the hereinafter styled and numbered cause: 90566 You are hereby commanded to appear before 40TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT of PLLIS COUNTY, TEXAS to be held at the courthouse of said county in the City of Waxahachie, County of Ellis County, Texas, by filing a written answer to the petition of Plaintiff at or before 10:00 A.M. of the Monday next after the expiration of 20 days after the date of service hereof, a copy of which accompanies this citation, in cause number 90566 styled. ≟VS- 🧯 VISION FINANCIAL CORPORATIO Filed in said court on the 11/19/2014 The name and address of the attorney for plaintiff, or the address of the plaintiff JR., ISRAEL, 115 EVENING STAR CIR, RED OAK, TX 75154. NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: "You have been sued. You may employ an attorney If you or your attorneys do not file a written answer with the clerk who issued this citation by 10:00 A M on the Monday next following the expiration of 20 days after you were served this citation and petition, a Default-Judgment may be taken against you." WITNESS: Melanie Reed District Clerk of the District Court of Ellis County Texas ISSUED AND GIVEN UNDER MY HAND AND SEAL OF SAID COURT AT COUNTY OF EIGHS, TEXAS, ON THIS THE 24th day of November, 2014. Melanie Reed, District Clerk 109 S. Jackson Street Rm. 209 Waxahachie, TX 75165 Mary Hinds, Deputy EXHIBIT A

GARCIA, JR., ISRAEL
-VSVISION FINANCIAL CORPORATION

NAME AND ADDRESS FOR SERVICE:

IN THE 40TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF ELLIS COUNTY, TEXAS

VISION FINANCIAL CORPORATION OF A CSC L			Company of the second	e	
C/O CORP SRVC CO, DBA CSC-LA 211 E 7TH ST, STE 620	WIEKS INC				3
AUSTIN, TX 78701					
AUSTIN, 12 76701					
Came to hand on the day of	Texas by delivering to ea	, 20, at	o'clock	m., and exec	cuted in
Citation with the date of delivery end	read thereon together w	ith the accompan	ving copy of the ORIG	PEISON, A MUE CO	My of the
following times and places, to-wit:	biscu increon, together w	im the accompan	ying copy of the Orac	SINADILITIN	, at uic
Name	Date/Time	Place, Cours	e and Distance from	Courthouse	
		· / · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
And not executed as to the defendant	(s),	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	
The diligence used in finding said def	endant(s) being:		e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e		
and the cause or failure to execute thi	s process is:				
and the information received as to the	whereabouts of said def	endant(s) being:	Ø 0 T		
	The second secon	Carlos B. Lopez			
		ct. 5, Travis Cou		l v	
FEES:	Constante	Ct. 5, Havis Co.	, Office	er	1 A
Serving Petition and Copy \$	_		, County, Texa	•) · · · ·	
Total \$					
	By:		, Deput	y	
				4 1	
	<u> </u>		Affi	ant	
COMPLETE IF YOU ARE A PERSON	<u>I OTHER THAN A SHEF</u>	UFF, CONSTABL	<u>E, OR CLERK OF TH</u>	E COURT.	·,
In accordance with Rule 107: The office return must either be verified or be significant below in substantially the following for	ned under penalty of per	wno serves, or att jury. A return sign	empts to serve, a citated under penalty of pe	erjury must conta	return. The in the statemen
그 그 그렇게 되어 하는 이 모음을 통해				× ×	
"My name is	, my date of birth is _	· .	, and my address is		
(First, Middle, Last)					
(Street, City, Zip)				- *	
I DECLARE UNDER PENALTY OF P	ERJURY THAT THE FOR	REGOING IS TRU	JE AND CORRECT.		.3
Executed inCounty,				<u>_</u> .	
				•	
	5.		d Decese Control		
	De	eclarant/Authorize	d Process Server		
	(Ic	# & expiration of	certification)		
RETURN TO:	, (14	in a expiration of	oorumounon,		
Melanie Reed Ellis County District	Clerk				
109 S. Jackson Street Rm. 209					
Waxahachie, TX 75165					
7	STATE OF TEX	AS §	,		
P. C.	COUNTY OF EL	_	• •		
	SIGNED under oat	v	nis day of		.20
The state of the s					·
1 3 3 4 2 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 1				Motory Dublic	State of Texas
and the second s				Motary Fuolic,	, State Of TEXAS

CAUSE NO	90566	
)	/lill/Nov ·
ISRAEL GARCIA JR.	j j	MELANIA ME
Plaintiff.)	IN THE DISTRICT COURTS TRICT CLEED
v.)	IN THE DISTRICT COURTS TRICT CLERK ELLIS COUNTY. TX
VISION FINANCIAL	}	
CORPORATION)	40 TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
Defendant.)	
)	ELLIG COLDYDY DEDVAG
)	ELLIS COUNTY, TEXAS
	,	

ORIGINAL PETITION

TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE OF SAID COURT:

Plaintiff Israel Garcia Jr., complains of Vision Financial Corporation Defendant, and for cause of action would respectfully show as follows:

NATURE OF ACTION

- 1. This is an action for damages brought by individual, Plaintiff Israel Garcia Jr. against Vision Financial Corporation. for violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA), 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A), 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(iii).
- Plaintiff contends that Defendant called his cellular telephone number using an automatic telephone dialing system as defined by the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47
 U.S.C. §227(a)(1) without express consent to do so.

DISCOVERY CONTROL PLAN

3. Pursuant to Rule 190.2 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure the discovery shall be conducted under level 1.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 4. This Court has jurisdiction over this matter because the amount in controversy exceeds the minimum jurisdictional limit of this Court. Jurisdiction of this Court arises under 47 U.S.C. §227(b)(3).
- 5. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391b. Venue in Ellis County, Texas, 40th Judicial District Court is proper in that the Plaintiff resides in State of Texas, Ellis County, City of Red Oak, the Defendant Vision Financial Corp. transacts business here, and the conduct complained of occurred here.
- 6. All conditions precedent to the bringing of this action, have been performed.

PARTIES

- 7. The Plaintiff in this lawsuit is Israel Garcia Jr., a natural person and a citizen of Ellis County, Texas.
- Defendant in this lawsuit is Vision Financial Corp. (herein after "VISION") a debt collection company with principal office at 5301 E State St Lower Level, Rockford, IL 61108.
- 9. VISION may be served with process by serving their registered agent at Corporation Service Company DBA CSC Lawyers Inco 211 E 7th Street Suite 620 Austin, TX 78701.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 10. On or about September 3, 2014 Defendant VISION began calling the Plaintiff's wireless cell phone 313- 310-4220 from telephone numbers 313-334-4563, 313-915-4242, 313-925-3282, 313-915-4244, 313-346-5378, 313-915-4435, 313-447-1419, 313-346-5100, 313-749-9961, 313-483-7904 which are numbers known to be used by VISION in their debt collection operations.
- 11. Defendant VISION called Plaintiff's cell phone number 313-310-4220, on the following dates and times:
 - 1) September 3, 2014 at 11:46 AM
 - 2) September 4, 2014 at 12;50 PM
 - 3) September 5, 2014 at 2:22 PM
 - 4) September 8, 2014 at 2:15 PM
 - 5) September 9, 2014 at 5:41 PM
 - 6) September 10, 2014 at 9:17 AM
 - 7) September 12, 2014 at 8:32 AM
 - 8) September 13, 2014 at 9:29 AM
 - 9) September 16, 2014 at 10:39 AM
 - 10) September 17, 2014 at 2:43 PM
 - 11) September 18, 2014 at 7:49 PM
 - 12) September 19, 2014 at 12:17 PM
 - 13) September 22, 2014 at 2:20 PM
 - 14) September 24, 2014 at 1:04 PM
 - 15) September 25, 2014 at 8:50 AM
 - 16) September 26, 2014 at 11:51 AM
 - 17) September 29, 2014 at 10:10 AM
 - 18) September 30, 2014 at 8:43 AM
 - 19) September 30, 2014 at 4:08 PM
 - 19) October 1, 2014 at 8:02 AM
 - 20) October 2, 2014 at 9:43 AM
 - 21) October 3, 2014 at 11:50 AM
 - 22) October 4, 2014 at 8:02AM
 - 23) October 6, 2014 at 10:51AM
 - 24) October 7, 2014 at 4:15 PM
 - 25) October 8, 2014 at 9:28 AM
 - 26) October 9, 2014 at 10:24AM

- 12. On September 19, 2014 at 5:41 PM and September 12, 2014 at 8:32AM Plaintiff answered the phone and Defendant VISION would not say anything and there would only silence.
- 13. On September 13, 2014 at 9:29 AM and September 22, 2014 at 2:20 PM, Plaintiff instructed the Defendant to quit calling his cell phone.
- 14. On October 1, 2014 at 8:02AM Plaintiff instructed the Defendant to quit calling his cell phone and Defendant would not say anything and there would only be silence and Defendant disconnected the call.
- 15. **Exhibit (A)** includes all the photos the plaintiff took during each and every call that the Defendant made to his cell phone.
- 16. **Refer to ¶10-14**; in each telephone communication, Defendant VISION used a telephone dialing system with the *capacity* to automatically dial Plaintiff's wireless cellular phone.
- 17. At no time has the Plaintiff given his express consent, written or otherwise, to Defendant VISION to call his wireless cellular telephone number (313) 310-4220.
- 18. **Refer to ¶10-14**; in each telephone communication, Defendant VISION attempted to contact the Plaintiff were for a non-emergency purpose.
- 19. Upon information and belief, in each telephone communication in question here, Defendant VISION used a telephone system which utilizes interactive voice recognition technology, also known as a predictive dialer, in which machine places calls, and when a consumer answers the phone there is a noticeable pause prior to being connected to a live representative.
- 20. **Refer to ¶19,** this technology, upon information and belief, dials several numbers simultaneously and connects the call only to those who answer.

- 21. Plaintiff has no prior or present established relationship with Defendant VISION.
- 22. Plaintiff has no contractual obligation to pay Defendant VISION any alleged consumer debt nor has ever heard of them.
- 23. On September 2, 2014 Plaintiff sent a letter informing Defendant VISION said actions were a violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA), 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A) and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(iii). This was in an effort to amicably resolve the matter prior to litigation. Defendant failed to respond.
- 24. All violations complained of herein occurred within the statute of limitations of the applicable federal statutes.

COUNT I

VIOLATION OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT 47 U.S.C. §227(b)(1)(A) BY DEFENDANT VISION FINANCIAL CORP.

- 25. Paragraphs 1 through 24 are re-alleged as though fully set forth herein.
- 26. Plaintiff and Defendant VISION do not have an established business relationship within the meaning of 47 U.S.C. §227(a)(2).
- 27. Defendant VISION called Plaintiff's cellular telephone using an "automatic telephone dialing system" within the meaning of 47 U.S.C. §227(a)(1).
- 28. In each telephone communication referenced in ¶10 through ¶14 Defendant VISION has demonstrated willful or knowing non-compliance with 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1)(A) by using equipment with automatic telephone dialing system or used a telephone dialing system that has the *capacity* to automatically call the Plaintiff's cellular telephone number (313) 310-4220, which is assigned to a cellular telephone service *with no* prior express consent and for no emergency purpose.

- 29. 47 U.S.C. §227(b)(1)(A) which states in part;
 - (b) RESTRICTIONS ON THE USE OF AUTOMATED TELEPHONE EQUIPMENT.—
 - (1) PROHIBITIONS.—It shall be unlawful for any person within the United States, or any person outside the United States if the recipient is within the United States—
 - (A) to make any call (other than a call made for emergency purposes or made with the prior express consent of the called party) using any automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice—

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief and judgment, as follows:

- a) Adjudging that Defendant violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act and/or admission from the Defendant(s) that they violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act;
- b) Awarding Plaintiff statutory damages, pursuant to 47 U.S.C §227(b)(3)(B); which states in part: an action to recover for actual monetary loss form such a violation, or to receive \$500 in damages for each such violation, whichever is greater.
- c) Awarding Plaintiff statutory damages, pursuant to 47 U.S.C §227(b)(3)(C); which states in part: If the Court finds that the Defendant willfully or knowingly violated this subsection or the regulations prescribed under this subsection, the Court may, in its discretion, increase the amount of the award to an amount equal to not more than 3 (three) times the amount available under subparagraph (B) of this paragraph.
- d) Awarding such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

COUNT II

VIOLATION OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT 47 U.S.C. §227(b)(1)(A)(iii) BY DEFENDANT VISION FINANCIAL CORP.

- 30. Plaintiff alleges and incorporates the information in paragraphs 1 through 29.
- 31. In each telephone communication referenced in ¶10 through ¶14, Defendant VISION has demonstrated willful or knowing non-compliance with 47 U.S.C. §227(b)(1)(A)(iii) by using equipment with automatic telephone dialing system or used a telephone dialing system that has the *capacity* to automatically call the Plaintiff's number (313) 310-4220, which is *assigned to a cellular telephone service*.
- 32. 47 U.S.C. §227(b)(1)(A)(iii) which states in part;
 - (b) RESTRICTIONS ON THE USE OF AUTOMATED TELEPHONE EQUIPMENT.—
 - (1) PROHIBITIONS.—It shall be unlawful for any person within the United States, or any person outside the United States if the recipient is within the United States—
 - (A) to make any call (other than a call made for emergency purposes or made with the prior express consent of the called party) using any automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice—
 - (iii) to any telephone number assigned to a paging service, cellular telephone service, specialized mobile radio service, or other radio common carrier service, or any service for which the called party is charged for the call;

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief and judgment, as follows:

e) Adjudging that Defendant violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act and/or admission from the Defendant(s) that they violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act;

f) Awarding Plaintiff statutory damages, pursuant to 47 U.S.C §227(b)(3)(B); which states in part: an action to recover for actual monetary loss form such a violation, or to receive \$500 in damages for each such violation, whichever is greater.

g) Awarding Plaintiff statutory damages, pursuant to 47 U.S.C §227(b)(3)(C); which states in part: If the Court finds that the Defendant willfully or knowingly violated this subsection or the regulations prescribed under this subsection, the Court may, in its discretion, increase the amount of the award to an amount equal to not more than 3 (three) times the amount available under subparagraph (B) of this paragraph.

h) Awarding such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

REQUEST FOR A RECORD

32. Pursuant to Texas Government Code section 52.046, the Plaintiff hereby request that an official court recorder attend and make full record of all hearings in this case.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff is entitled to and hereby demands trial by jury.

Dated: November 17, 2014

Respectfully Submitted,

Israel Garcia Jr.
115 Evening Star Cir

Red Oak, TX 75154

(972) 816-6374

igarcia75115@yahoo.com